

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the original filing of February 27, 2004. Claims 1-15 are pending and have been considered below:

Allowable Subject Matter

1. Claims 19, 21, 33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 10, 12, 15, 22,23, 25, 26, 28, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chua (US 2004/0183833 A1).

Claim 1: Chua discloses a method comprising:

associating areas of a touch interface of a mobile electronic device with letters such that each area is associated with only one letter and at least some of the associated areas overlap with one another (Page 2, Paragraph 23 and 24) ;

detecting a location of a user's touch on said touch interface and for each area of said touch interface which includes said location, identifying the letter associated therewith (Page 2, Paragraph 19 and 20).

Claim 3: Chua discloses a method as in Claim 1 and further discloses if two or more letters are identified, using predictive software text to determine which of said identified letters said user intended to select (Page 2, Paragraph 23),(Page 5, Paragraph 55).

Claim 4: Chua discloses a method as in Claim 3 and further discloses providing said predictive software text with an indication that said location is closer to one of said identified letters than to others of said identified letters (Page 2, Paragraph 23),(Page 5, Paragraph 55).

Claim 5: Chua discloses a method as in Claim 3 and further discloses providing said predictive software text with an indication of how much closer said location is to one of

said identified letters than to others of said identified letters (Page 2, Paragraph 23),
(Page 5, Paragraph 55).

Claim 6: Chua discloses a mobile electronic device comprising:

one or more touch interfaces to receive a touch by a user (Page 2, Paragraphs 19 and 20);

means for displaying one or more rows of letters (Page 2, Paragraphs 19 and 20);

means for associating overlapping areas of said one or more touch interfaces with said letters such that each area is associated with only one letter and at least one of the areas overlap with one another (Page 2, Paragraphs 19-24);

and a microprocessor configured to identify which letters are associated with said areas of said touch interfaces that include a location of said touch (Page 2, Paragraphs 22 and 26).

Claim 22: Claim 22 is similar in scope to Claim 6 and is rejected with the same rationale.

Claim 7: Chua discloses a mobile electronic device as in Claim 6 above wherein said one or more touch interfaces is a single touchpad (Page 2, Paragraphs 18-20).

Claim 23: Claim 23 is similar in scope to Claim 7 and is rejected with the same rationale.

Claim 9: Chua discloses a mobile electronic device as in Claim 6 above wherein said one or more touch interfaces are two or more touchpads (Page 2, Paragraphs 18-20).

Claim 25: Claim 25 is similar in scope to Claim 9 and is rejected with the same rationale.

Claim 10: Chua discloses a mobile electronic device as in Claim 6 above and further discloses where said one or more touch interfaces is a single touchscreen (Page 2, Paragraphs 18-20).

Claim 26: Claim 26 is similar in scope to Claim 10 and is rejected with the same rationale.

Claim 12: Chua discloses a mobile electronic device as in Claim 10 above and discloses where for at least one particular letter, an area of said touchscreen associated with said particular letter is overlapped by an area of said touchscreen associated with a different letter of an adjacent row (Page 2, Paragraphs 19-24).

Claim 28: Claim 28 is similar in scope to Claim 12 and is rejected with the same rationale.

Claim 15: Chua discloses a mobile electronic device as in Claim 6 above and further discloses that said microprocessor is configured to execute a predictive software text module to determine which of said identified letters said user intended to select (Page 2, Paragraphs 18-20).

Claim 31: Claim 31 is similar in scope to Claim 15 and is rejected with the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 13, 14, 16, 17, 29, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chua (US 2004/0183833 A1).

Claims 16: Chua discloses a method as in Claim 1 above and but does not explicitly disclose where for at least one particular letter, an area of said touch interface

associated with said particular letter is completely overlapped jointly by a portion of an area of said touch interface associated with an adjacent letter to the left of said particular letter and by a portion of an area of said touch interface associated with an adjacent letter to the right of said particular letter. However Chua does disclose allowing different letters being represented in overlapped area so by extending the offset which can be set by user complete overlap is possible (Page 3, Paragraph 29) (Page 2, Paragraph 24). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to allow complete overlapping. One would have been motivated to allow overlapping to compress the size of data on the display screen.

Claims 13 and 29: Claims 13 and 29 are similar in scope to Claim 16 and is rejected with the same rationale.

Claims 17: Chua discloses a method as in Claim 1 above but does not explicitly disclose where for at least one particular letter, an area of said touch interface associated with said particular letter is partially overlapped by a portion of an area of said touch interface associated with an adjacent letter to the left of said particular letter and by a portion of an area of said touch interface associated with an adjacent letter to the right of said particular letter. However Chua does disclose allowing different letters being represented in overlapped area and setting offset (Page 2, Paragraph 24). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to allow

partial overlapping. One would have been motivated to allow overlapping to compress the size of data on the display screen.

Claims 14 and 30: Claims 14 and 30 are similar in scope to Claim 17 and is rejected with the same rationale.

6. Claims 8, 11, 24 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chua (US 2004/0183833 A1) in view of Moon et al (US 6259436 B1)

Claim 8: Chua discloses a mobile electronic device as in Claim 7 above but does not explicitly disclose that said rows of letters are spaced at a sufficient vertical distance that there is no ambiguity as to which row of letters is being touched. However Moon discloses an apparatus and method for determining selection of touchable items on a computer touchscreen by an imprecise touch and further discloses having sufficient space on a touchscreen and or keyboard (Column 4, Lines 41-49) (Column 5, Lines 1-15). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to also provide sufficient space on a keyboard of Chua. One would have been motivated to provide sufficient space between letters to cut down on the high risk of errors.

Claim 24: Claim 24 is similar in scope to Claim 8 and is rejected with the same rationale.

Claim 11: Chua discloses a mobile electronic device as in Claim 10 above but does not explicitly disclose that said rows of letters are spaced at a sufficient vertical distance that there is no ambiguity as to which row of letters is being touched. However Moon discloses an apparatus and method for determining selection of touchable items on a computer touchscreen by an imprecise touch and further discloses having sufficient space on a touchscreen (Column 4, Lines 41-49). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to also provide sufficient space on the keyboard representation of Chua. One would have been motivated to provide sufficient space between letters to cut down on the high risk of errors.

Claim 27: Claim 27 is similar in scope to Claim 11 and is rejected with the same rationale.

7. Claims 18, 20 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chua (US 2004/0183833 A1) in view of Suraqui (US 7199786 B2)

Claim 18: Chua discloses a method as in Claim 1 above but does not explicitly disclose wherein at least one particular letter, the associating step comprises associating an area of said touch interface with said particular letter by bounding said area by horizontal centers of adjacent letters on the same row as the particular letter, and by the

Art Unit: 2174

vertical centers of adjacent letters on upper and lower adjacent rows. However Suragui discloses letters and centered in the vertical and horizontal centers (Fig 4). Therefore it would have been obvious to display the letter by the centers in Chua as taught by Suragui. One would have been motivated to display the letter by the centers because it is a design choice, which allows customization of the system.

Claims 20 and 32: Claims 20 and 32 are similar in scope to Claim 18 and is rejected with the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

Argument of Claim 1: Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicants' argument that there is no overlapping, Chua allows letters to be associated with a defined area (Figures 1 and 3) and the selection possibility to expand within other areas, this is incorporated by the offset into bordering letters and is a method of overlapping.

Argument of Claims 8 and 11: Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicants' argument that is no vertical spacing,

Moon discloses that there is some standard of spacing by configuring the target areas to be sized (e.g. length, width, height, diameter, perimeter, and area) in purpose to designate a definite area for selection. Therefore a vertical spacing falls within the sized parameters.

Argument of Claim 13: Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicants' argument of the complete overlapping, Chua does disclose allowing different letters being represented in overlapped area so by extending the offset, which can be set by user complete overlap is therefore obviously achievable (Page 3, Paragraph 29) (Page 2, Paragraph 24).

Argument of Claim 14: Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicants' argument that there is partial overlapping, Chua does disclose allowing different letters being represented in overlapped area so by extending the offset, which can be set by user the partial overlap is therefore obviously achievable to adjacent letters (Page 3, Paragraph 29) (Page 2, Paragraph 24).

Conclusion

Applicants amendments necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sherrod Keaton whose telephone number is 571) 270-1697. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. and alternating Fri. off (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, KRISTINE KINCAID can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3800.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sy D Luu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174

SLK

11-11-07